



Overview of my research on innovation

Bronwyn H. Hall

UC Berkeley and University of Maastricht

NBER, IFS, and NIESR



Overview

- **Broad themes**
 - Inputs: incentives for innovative activity by firms
 - Outputs: measurement of innovation results
- **Methodologies**
 - Microeconomic panel data studies
 - Patent data analysis
 - Largely firm-based
- **Surveys**



Drivers of innovation

- Science base
 - Research output of universities and PROs
- Human capital
 - Trained scientists and engineers
- Subsidies for R&D and commercialization
- Tax system and financing
 - Treatment of R&D; patent boxes
 - Financial system
- IP rights and the functioning of the IP system
- Regulatory environment



Subsidies

- **Hall, Link, & Scott**, looked at ATP research partnerships, focus on universities
 - More likely to be “new” science, subject to difficulty & delay, but not more likely to be terminated
 - Biggest contracting problem was negotiating IP rights
- **David, Hall, & Toole**, surveyed studies of additionality, finding ambiguous results
 - More likely additional in Europe and aggregate than in US and micro
 - Highlighted the implications of increased demand for S&Es
- **Hall & Maffioli**, surveyed results of Latin American programs
 - Subsidies generally increased R&D intensity (additionality)
 - Increased firm growth, but little other performance impact (productivity or patents), possibly because of short horizon

Choosing the level of R&D

- Profit-maximizing firm Invests in R&D until the after-tax marginal product of the resulting capital asset is equal to the tax-adjusted user cost of capital.

$$(1 - \tau)MPK = c_t = (1 - \tau)(1 - \varphi) \left[(r + \delta)p_t - \dot{p}_t \right]$$

- Therefore, R&D will depend on
 - Investor's required rate of return r
 - (Economic) depreciation rate of the asset δ
 - Marginal adjustment cost of R&D program (not shown)
 - Corporate tax rate τ
 - Tax credits, if present (φ)

NB: *if* R&D is expensed and there is no special tax treatment, tax effects will not matter

R&D tax credits

- **Hall (1992b)** - first to use a theory-based investment equation and firm panel data to look at the impact of the R&D tax credit on R&D investment.
 - Modeled profit-maximizing firm facing adjustment costs on R&D and a price that depends on its tax position
 - Based on public firm data (not tax returns), so tax price of R&D inferred
 - Found large positive elasticities of R&D to its tax price (approx one or two)
 - Confirmed by much subsequent research, including cross-country (**Hall and Van Reenen** survey)



Financing R&D

- **Hall (1992a)** looks at the role of external financing (debt and equity) for R&D in US firms
 - Finds cash flow sensitivity (external finance more expensive than internal)
 - Equity preferred to debt for external financing
- **Hall and Hall (1993)**
 - investors in US firms use lower discount rates for R&D, implying lack of short-termism
- **Mulkay, Hall, and Mairesse** compare firms in US and France
 - Greater sensitivity of R&D and investment to cash flow in US
 - No difference in response to output growth
- **Hottenrott, Hall, and Czarnitzki (2014)** – Belgian firms
 - Patents mitigate the cash flow constraint, especially for smaller firms
- Several surveys, some of which look at innovation more broadly



Measurement of output

- Returns to R&D and innovation
 - Innovative sales
 - Productivity
 - Firm growth
 - Firm market value
- Use of patent data

Returns to R&D and innovation

- **Hall (2005)** identified the centrality of the depreciation rate in measuring the returns or value of R&D
 - Found higher rates in IT than in pharmaceuticals
- **Hall and Mairesse (1995)**
 - Productivity of R&D in France strongly positive in 1980s
 - Explores several measurement issues (deprec, sales v VA,..)
- **Hall, Lotti, and Mairesse (2008, 2009, 2012)** – Italian firms
 - Employment growth comes equally from product innovation and increased sales of old products
 - Among SMEs, both process and product innovation improve productivity, more for process
 - Both R&D and ICT investment associated with innovation and productivity, with apparently high rates of return

Market value

- R&D and innovation are investments, so evaluation should use forward-looking measures
- In countries with “efficient” and liquid capital markets, firm value may provide such a measure.
- Basic Tobin’s q relationship (hedonic equation):
$$V(\text{assets}) = \text{debt} + \text{equity}$$
$$= f(\text{capital}, R\&D\text{capital}, \text{other intangibles})$$
- But... *“Past performance is no guarantee of future results.”*
- => One should be cautious with interpretation



Market value papers

- Hall (1993a,b) explores the decline in value of R&D in US corporations during 1980s
 - Due to restructuring in manufacturing
 - Writeoff of R&D assets in computing (PC revolution?)
- Hall, Oriani, Czarnitzki (various)
 - Looks at R&D valuation in European firms
- Hall, Jaffe, Trajtenberg (2005); Hall, Thoma, and Torrisi (2010); Hall and MacGarvie(2010)
 - Market value of various patent indicators (discussed later)



Patent system

- Two major research areas with very different aims and interests, but interrelated
 - **Normative** - patent policy and IP strategy
 - Existence and design of patent system – length, breadth
 - Firm strategic choices – secrecy, patenting, litigation, licensing
 - Enforcement and administration; interaction with antitrust
 - **Positive** - patents and citations as indicators
 - Measures of inventive output (rather than input)
 - Citations as measures of knowledge “spillover,” where we can identify the recipient as well as the source



Patent use and patent policy

- Hall and Ziedonis (2001)
 - Why did patenting rate in the semiconductor industry double between 1985 and 1995?
 - primarily for defensive reasons
- Hall (2005)
 - What are the sources of US patent growth 1965-2002?
 - Structural break in 1984 confined to ICT technologies
 - For US firms, growth concentrated in ICT industries, in all technologies
- Graham, Hall, Harhoff, and Mowery (2002)
 - Does post-grant third party opposition improve the quality or screening of patents?
 - Possibly, based on comparison of EPO opposition with US re-examination for “equivalent” patents
 - Valuable patents more often challenged, at least one third revoked and another third restricted



Patent use and performance

- Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena (2013); Hall and Sena (2013)
 - Is use of patents or formal IP associated with UK firm performance?
 - Yes for productivity and innovative sales share
 - No for employment growth
- Hall, Helmers, and von Graevenitz (2013)
 - Do patent thickets discourage entry?
 - Yes, at least into patenting in the UK

Hall, Jaffe, Trajtenberg (2005)

- Relate firm market value to the stock of R&D, patents per R&D, and cites per patent.
 - Cites per patent are more important than patent yield itself
 - Increase of one cite per patent is associated with an increase of 3-4% in market value
- Break up cites per patent into five ranges: 0 to 4, 4 to 6, 6 to 10, 10 to 20, over 20
 - Only the latter three categories are positive; the other two are zero
 - 50-75% boost to market value if citations per patent average above 20!
- Timing – do citations received before value is measured matter more or less than those received after?
 - Less, although they are useful for forecasting.
 - Predictable and unpredictable citations receive approximately equal weight.



Self citations

- Self-cites = citations to patents owned by the same firm.
 - More valuable => “owning” a technology trajectory, cumulativeness is valuable
 - Less valuable => cite whatever is at hand, does not necessarily signify any value
- Results
 - High self-citation share is valuable (worth about twice as much) if firm is small or medium-sized, neutral if firm is large.
 - Not having self cites is negative if firm is large, positive if firm is small.

Surveys – R&D

- Financing of R&D and innovation
 - [Hall & Lerner \(2010\)](#). The Financing of R&D and Innovation. In Hall & Rosenberg, Handbook of the Economics of Innovation, Elsevier, 609-639.
 - [Hall \(2009\)](#). The Financing of Innovation, European Investment Bank Papers 14 (2): 1-23.
- R&D
 - [Hall \(2011\)](#). The Internationalization of R&D. In Sydor (ed.), Global Value Chains: Impacts and Implications, Ottawa, Canada: Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, 179-210.
 - [David, Hall, & Toole \(2000\)](#). Is Public R&D a Complement or Substitute for Private R&D? A Review of the Econometric Evidence. Research Policy 29: 497-529.
 - [Hall & van Reenen \(2000\)](#). How Effective are Fiscal Incentives for R&D? A New Review of the Evidence. Research Policy 29: 449-469.
 - [Hall \(1996\)](#). The Private and Social Returns to Research and Development: What Have We Learned?. In Smith & Barfield (eds.), Technology, R&D, and the Economy, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution and AEI



Surveys - innovation

- Innovation and productivity
 - Hall and Mohnen (2013). Innovation and Productivity: An Update. *Eurasian Business Review* 3(1): 47-65.
 - Hall (2011). Innovation and Productivity, *Nordic Economic Policy Review* 2011 (2): 167-204.
- Innovation and market value
 - Hall (2000). Innovation and Market Value. In Barrell, Mason, and O'Mahoney (eds.), *Productivity, Innovation and Economic Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 175-198.
- Innovation and diffusion
 - Hall (2004). Innovation and Diffusion. In Fagerberg, Mowery, and Nelson (eds.), *Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford University Press.

Surveys - patents

- Patents and patent policy
 - Hall and Harhoff (2012). Recent Research on the Economics of Patents. *Annual Review of Economics* 4: 541-565.
 - Hall (2007). Patents and Patent Policy. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 23 (4): 1–20.
- IP choice (formal vs informal)
 - Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena (2014). The choice between formal and informal intellectual property: A literature review. *Journal of Economic Literature* 52(2): 375–423.
- IP and technology transfer
 - Hall (2014). Does Patent Protection Help or Hinder Technology Transfer?. In S. Ahn, B. H. Hall, and K. Lee (eds.), *Intellectual Property for Economic Development: Issues and Policy Implications*, Edward Elgar.